

# AN EXAMPLE OF ONE - DIMENSIONAL PHASE TRANSITION

**U.A. Rozikov**

*Institute of Mathematics, 29, F.Hodjaev str., 700143, Tashkent, Uzbekistan.*

*e-mail: rozikovu@yandex.ru*

---

**Abstract.** In the paper a one-dimensional model with nearest - neighbor interactions  $I_n, n \in \mathbf{Z}$  and spin values  $\pm 1$  is considered. We describe a condition on parameters  $I_n$  under which the phase transition occurs. In particular, we show that the phase transition occurs if  $I_n \geq |n|, n \in \mathbf{Z}$ .

*Keywords:* Configuration; One-dimension; Phase transition; Gibbs measure

---

## 1 Introduction

Interest in phase transition in one-dimensional systems has gained due to Little's work [8]. Existence or nonexistence depends markedly upon the model employed. In [11] Van Hove shows (see also [9, section 5.6.]) a one-dimensional system can not exhibit a phase transition if the (translation-invariant) forces are of finite range.

An interesting one-dimensional model considered by Baur and Nosanow [1], giving rise to a phase transition with only nearest- neighbor interactions which has some of the interaction constants equal to minus infinity. Note that in a particular case the model which we shall consider here is a model with only nearest-neighbor interactions without assumption of existence a interaction equal to minus infinity (cf. with [1]).

An other examples of one-dimensional phase transitions for models with long range interactions were considered in [3-7], [10].

In the paper we consider the Hamiltonian

$$H(\sigma) = \sum_{l=(x-1,x):x \in \mathbf{Z}} I_x \mathbf{1}_{\sigma(x-1) \neq \sigma(x)}, \quad (1)$$

where  $\mathbf{Z} = \{..., -1, 0, 1, ...\}$ ,  $\sigma = \{\sigma(x) \in \{-1, 1\} : x \in \mathbf{Z}\} \in \emptyset = \{-1, 1\}^{\mathbf{Z}}$ , and  $I_x \in R$  for any  $x \in \mathbf{Z}$ .

The goal of this paper is to describe a condition on parameters of the model (1) under which the phase transition occurs.

## 2 Phase transition

Let us consider the sequence  $\mathbf{L}_n = [-n, n], n = 0, 1, \dots$  and denote  $\mathbf{L}_n^c = \mathbf{Z} \setminus \mathbf{L}_n$ . Consider boundary condition  $\sigma_n^{(+)} = \sigma_{\mathbf{L}_n^c} = \{\sigma(x) = +1 : x \in \mathbf{L}_n^c\}$ . The energy  $H_n^+(\sigma)$  of the

configuration  $\sigma$  in the presence of boundary condition  $\sigma_n^{(+)}$  is expressed by the formula

$$H_n^+(\sigma) = \sum_{l=(x-1,x):x \in \mathbb{L}_n} I_x \mathbf{1}_{\sigma(x-1) \neq \sigma(x)} + I_{-n} \mathbf{1}_{\sigma(-n) \neq 1} + I_{n+1} \mathbf{1}_{\sigma(n) \neq 1}. \quad (2)$$

The Gibbs measure on  $\mathcal{O}_n = \{-1, 1\}^{\mathbb{L}_n}$  with boundary condition  $\sigma_n^{(+)}$  is defined in the usual way

$$\mu_{n,\beta}^+(\sigma) = Z^{-1}(n, \beta, +) \exp(-\beta H_n^+(\sigma)), \quad (3)$$

where  $\beta = T^{-1}$ ,  $T > 0$  – temperature and  $Z(n, \beta, +)$  is the normalizing factor (statistical sum).

Denote by  $\sigma_n^+$  the configuration on  $\mathbf{Z}$  such that  $\sigma_n^+(x) \equiv +1$  for any  $x \in \mathbb{L}_n^c$ .

Put

$$A(\sigma_n^+) = \{x \in \mathbf{Z} : \sigma_n^+(x) = -1\},$$

$$\partial(\sigma_n^+) = \{l = (m-1, m) \in \mathbf{Z} \times \mathbf{Z} : \sigma_n^+(m-1) \neq \sigma_n^+(m)\}.$$

Note that there is one-to-one correspondence between the set of all configurations  $\sigma_n^+$  and the set of all subsets  $A$  of  $\mathbb{L}_n$ .

Let  $A'(\sigma_n^+)$  be the set of all maximal connected subsets of  $A(\sigma_n^+)$ .

LEMMA 1. *Let  $B \subset \mathbf{Z}$  be a fixed connected set and  $p_\beta^+(B) = \mu_{n,\beta}^+ \{\sigma_n^+ : B \in A'(\sigma_n^+)\}$ . Then*

$$p_\beta^+(B) \leq \exp \left\{ -\beta \left[ I_{n_B} + I_{N_B+1} \right] \right\},$$

where  $n_B$  (resp.  $N_B$ ) is the left (resp. right) endpoint of  $B$ .

*Proof.* Denote  $F_B = \{\sigma_n^+ : B \in A'(\sigma_n^+)\}$  – the set of all configurations  $\sigma_n^+$  on  $\mathbf{Z}$  with "+"-boundary condition (i.e.  $\sigma_n^+(x) \equiv +1$  for any  $x \in \mathbb{L}_n^c$ ) such that  $B$  is maximal connected set. Denote also  $F_B^- = \{\sigma_n^+ : B \cap A'(\sigma_n^+) = \emptyset\}$ . Define the map  $\chi_B : F_B \rightarrow F_B^-$  as following: for  $\sigma_n \in F_B$  we destroy the set  $B$  changing the values  $\sigma_n(x)$  inside of  $B$  to  $+1$ . The constructed configuration is  $\chi_B(\sigma_n) \in F_B^-$ .

For a given  $B$  the map  $\chi_B$  is one-to-one map.

For  $\sigma_n \in F_B$  it is clear that

$$A'(\sigma_n) = A'(\chi_B(\sigma_n)) \cup B, \quad \partial(\sigma_n) = \partial(\chi_B(\sigma_n)) \cup \{(n_B - 1, n_B), (N_B, N_B + 1)\}.$$

Thus we have

$$H_n^+(\sigma_n) - H_n^+(\chi_B(\sigma_n)) = I_{n_B} + I_{N_B+1}. \quad (4)$$

By definition we have

$$p_\beta^+(B) = \frac{\sum_{\sigma_n \in F_B} \exp\{-\beta H_n^+(\sigma_n)\}}{\sum_{\sigma_n} \exp\{-\beta H_n^+(\sigma_n)\}} \leq \frac{\sum_{\sigma_n \in F_B} \exp\{-\beta H_n^+(\sigma_n)\}}{\sum_{\sigma_n \in F_B} \exp\{-\beta H_n^+(\chi_B(\sigma_n))\}}. \quad (5)$$

Using (4) from (5) we get

$$\begin{aligned}
p_\beta^+(B) &\leq \frac{\sum_{\sigma_n \in F_B} \exp \left\{ -\beta H_n^+(\chi_B(\sigma_n)) - \beta [I_{n_B} + I_{N_B+1}] \right\}}{\sum_{\sigma_n \in F_B} \exp \{-\beta H_n^+(\chi_B(\sigma_n))\}} = \\
&\exp \left\{ -\beta [I_{n_B} + I_{N_B+1}] \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

The lemma is proved.

Assume that for any  $r \in \{1, 2, \dots\}$  and  $n \in \mathbf{Z}$  the Hamiltonian (1) satisfies the following condition

$$I_n + I_{n+r} \geq r. \quad (6)$$

LEMMA 2. *Assume condition (6) is satisfied. Then for all sufficiently large  $\beta$ , there is a constant  $C = C(\beta) > 0$ , such that*

$$\mu_\beta^+ \{ \sigma_n : |B| > C \ln |L_n| \text{ for some } B \in A'(\sigma_n) \} \rightarrow 0, \text{ as } |L_n| \rightarrow \infty,$$

where  $|\cdot|$  denotes the number of elements.

*Proof.* Suppose  $\beta > 1$ , then by Lemma 1 and condition (6) we have

$$\mu_\beta^+ \{ \sigma_n : B \in A'(\sigma_n), t \in B, |B| = r \} = \sum_{B: t \in B, |B|=r} p_\beta^+(B) \leq r \exp \{-\beta r\}.$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu_\beta^+ \{ \sigma_n : B \in A'(\sigma_n), t \in B, |B| > C_1 \ln |L_n| \} &\leq \sum_{r \geq C_1 \ln |L_n|} r \exp \{-\beta r\} \leq \\
\sum_{r \geq C_1 \ln |L_n|} \exp \{(1-\beta)r\} &= \frac{|L_n|^{C_1(1-\beta)}}{1 - e^{1-\beta}}, \tag{7}
\end{aligned}$$

where  $C_1$  will be defined latter. Thus we have

$$\mu_\beta^+ \{ \sigma_n : \exists B \in A'(\sigma_n), |B| > C_1 \ln |L_n| \} \leq \frac{|L_n|^{C_1(1-\beta)+1}}{1 - e^{1-\beta}}.$$

The last expression tends to zero if  $|L_n| \rightarrow \infty$  and  $C_1 > \frac{1}{\beta-1}$ . The lemma is proved.

LEMMA 3. *Assume the condition (6) is satisfied. Then*

$$\mu_\beta^+ \{ \sigma_n : \sigma_n(0) = -1 \} \rightarrow 0, \text{ as } \beta \rightarrow \infty. \quad (8)$$

*Proof.* If  $\sigma_n(0) = -1$ , then 0 is point for some  $B \in A'(\sigma_n)$ . Consequently,

$$\mu_\beta^+ \{ \sigma_n : 0 \in B, |B| < C_1 \ln |L_n| \} \leq \sum_{r=1}^{C_1 \ln |L_n|} (e^{1-\beta})^r \leq \frac{e^{1-\beta}}{1 - e^{1-\beta}}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_\beta^+ \{ \sigma_n(0) = -1 \} &\leq \mu_\beta^+ \{ \sigma_n : 0 \in B, \ B \in A'(\sigma_n) \} \leq \\ &\leq \frac{e^{1-\beta}}{1 - e^{1-\beta}} + \frac{|L_n|^{C_1(1-\beta)+1}}{1 - e^{1-\beta}}. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

For  $|L_n| \rightarrow \infty$  and  $\beta \rightarrow \infty$  from (9) we get (8). The lemma is proved.

**THEOREM 4.** *Assume the condition (6) is satisfied. For all sufficiently large  $\beta$  there are at least two Gibbs measures for the model (1) .*

*Proof.* Using a similar argument one can prove

$$\mu_\beta^- \{ \sigma_n : \sigma_n(0) = 1 \} \rightarrow 0, \text{ as } \beta \rightarrow \infty.$$

Consequently, for sufficiently large  $\beta$  we have

$$\mu_\beta^+ \{ \sigma_n : \sigma_n(0) = -1 \} \neq \mu_\beta^- \{ \sigma_n : \sigma_n(0) = -1 \}.$$

This completes the proof.

Denote

$$\mathcal{H} = \{ H : H \text{ (see (1)) satisfies the condition (6)} \}$$

The following example shows that the set  $\mathcal{H}$  is not empty.

**Example.** Consider Hamiltonian (1) with  $I_m \geq |m|$ ,  $m \in \mathbf{Z}$ . Then

$$I_m + I_{m+k} \geq |m| + |m+k| \geq k$$

for all  $m \in \mathbf{Z}$  and  $k \geq 1$ . Thus the condition (6) is satisfied.

**Acknowledgments.** The work supported by NATO Reintegration Grant : FEL. RIG. 980771. The final part of this work was done in the Physics Department of “La Sapienza” University in Rome. I thank M.Cassandro and G.Gallavotti for an invitation to the “La Sapienza” University and useful discussions. I thank the referee for useful suggestions.

## References

1. Baur M., Nosanow L. *J. Chemical Phys.* **37**: 153-160 (1962).
2. Cassandro M., Ferrari P., Merola I., Presutti E. *arXiv: math-ph/ 021 1062*, **2** 28 Nov 2002.
3. Dyson F. *Commun. Math. Phys.* **12**: 91-107 (1969)
4. Dyson F. *Commun. Math. Phys.* **21**: 269-283 (1971)
5. Flohlich J., Spencer T. *Commun. Math. Phys.* **84**: 87-101 (1982)
6. Johansson K. *Commun. Math. Phys.* **141**: 41-61 (1991)
7. Johansson K. *Commun. Math. Phys.* **169** : 521-561 (1995)
8. Little W., *Phys. Rev.* **134**: A1416-A1424 (1964)
9. Ruelle D., *Statistical mechanics (rigorous results)*, Benjamin, New York, 1969
10. Strecker J. *J. Math. Phys.* **10**: 1541-1554 (1969)
11. Van Hove L. *Physica* **16**: 137-143 (1950).